

THE STARRED DIXMIER CONJECTURE FOR A_1

VERED MOSKOWICZ AND CHRISTIAN VALQUI

ABSTRACT. Let $A_1(K) = K\langle x, y | yx - xy = 1 \rangle$ be the first Weyl algebra over a characteristic zero field K and let α be the exchange involution on $A_1(K)$ given by $\alpha(x) = y$ and $\alpha(y) = x$. The Dixmier conjecture of Dixmier (1968) asks: Is every algebra endomorphism of the Weyl algebra $A_1(K)$ an automorphism? The aim of this paper is to prove that each α -endomorphism of $A_1(K)$ is an automorphism. Here an α -endomorphism of $A_1(K)$ is an endomorphism which preserves the involution α . We also prove an analogue result for the Jacobian conjecture in dimension 2, called $\alpha - JC_2$.

1 Introduction

By definition, the n 'th Weyl algebra $A_n(K) = A_n$ is the unital associative K -algebra generated by $2n$ elements $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n$ subject to the following defining relations: $[y_i, x_j] = \delta_{ij}$, $[x_i, x_j] = 0$ and $[y_i, y_j] = 0$, where δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta.

Here we will only deal with the first Weyl algebra $A_1(K) = K\langle x, y | yx - xy = 1 \rangle$, where $\text{Char}(K) = 0$. (Only in Proposition 2.6 the field K is not necessarily of zero characteristic).

In [1] Adjamagbo and van den Essen remarked that A_1 was first studied by Dirac in [7]. Hence, they suggest to call it “Dirac quantum algebra” instead of (first) Weyl algebra. Similarly, they suggest to call A_n “ n 'th Dirac quantum algebra” instead of n 'th Weyl algebra. We truly do not know which name is better. For convenience, in order to maintain the same terminology used by most of the authors, we shall continue to call A_1 the first Weyl algebra (and A_n the n 'th Weyl algebra).

In [8], Dixmier asked six questions about the first Weyl algebra $A_1(K)$, where K is a zero characteristic field; the first question is the following: Is every algebra endomorphism of $A_1(K)$ an automorphism?

Usually, Dixmier's first question is brought as a conjecture; namely, the Dixmier conjecture says that every algebra endomorphism of $A_1(K)$ is an automorphism.

In order to define a K -algebra homomorphism $f : A_1 \rightarrow A_1$, it is enough to fix $f(x)$ and $f(y)$ such that $[f(y), f(x)] = f(y)f(x) - f(x)f(y) = 1$, and extend it as an algebra homomorphism, and similarly for an antihomomorphism.

Recall that an antihomomorphism satisfies $f(ab) = f(b)f(a)$ and notice that the mapping $\alpha : A_1 \rightarrow A_1$ defined by $\alpha(x) = y$ and $\alpha(y) = x$, is an involution on A_1 . Indeed, α is an antihomomorphism of order 2, so it is an antiautomorphism of order 2. This mapping α is sometimes called the exchange involution.

Of course, there are other involutions on A_1 . For example, given any automorphism g of A_1 , $g^{-1}\alpha g$ is clearly an involution on A_1 .

Generally, it is easy to see that each involution on A_1 is of the form $h\alpha$, where h is an automorphism of A_1 which satisfies the following condition $h\alpha h\alpha = 1$. Indeed,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16W20, 14R15; Secondary 16S32.

Vered Moskowicz was supported partially by an Israel-US BSF grant #2010/149.

Christian Valqui was supported by PUCP-DGI-2012-0011 and PUCP-DGI-2013-3036.

let β be any involution on A_1 . Then $\beta\alpha$ is an automorphism of A_1 , call it h . From $\beta\alpha = h$ follows $\beta = h\alpha$. Of course, since $\beta^2 = 1$, we get $h\alpha h\alpha = 1$.

Definition 1.1. An α -endomorphism f of A_1 is an endomorphism of A_1 which preserves the involution α . Preserving the involution α means that for every $w \in A_1$, $f(\alpha(w)) = \alpha(f(w))$. So an α -endomorphism of A_1 , f , is an endomorphism of A_1 which commutes with α ($f \circ \alpha = \alpha \circ f$).

It is easy to see that

$$f(\alpha(w)) = \alpha(f(w)), \quad \forall w \in A_1 \iff f(\alpha(x)) = \alpha(f(x)), \quad f(\alpha(y)) = \alpha(f(y)).$$

Therefore, f is an α -endomorphism of A_1 , if f is an endomorphism of A_1 , for which $f(\alpha(x)) = \alpha(f(x))$ and $f(\alpha(y)) = \alpha(f(y))$.

Now, one may pose the “ α -Dixmier conjecture” or the “starred Dixmier conjecture”: Every α -endomorphism of $A_1(K)$ ($\text{Char}(K) = 0$) is an automorphism.

Remark 1.2. The exchange involution α may be denoted by “ $*$ on the right”, instead of “ α on the left” (namely, $x^* = y$ and $y^* = x$ instead of $\alpha(x) = y$ and $\alpha(y) = x$), hence the name the “starred Dixmier conjecture”.

In the following example we describe a family of α -endomorphisms of any given even degree $2n$ (this family also includes degree 1 α -endomorphisms), which is actually a family of α -automorphisms:

Example 1.3. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $a, b, c_0, \dots, c_n \in K$, with $a^2 - b^2 = 1$, and define $S_j := c_j(x - y)^{2j}$. The following f defines an α -automorphism:

$$f(x) := ax + by + \sum_{j=0}^n S_j \quad \text{and} \quad f(y) := ay + bx + \sum_{j=0}^n S_j.$$

In fact, clearly $\alpha(S_j) = S_j$ and so $f(\alpha(x)) = \alpha(f(x))$ and $f(\alpha(y)) = \alpha(f(y))$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} [f(y), f(x)] &= [ay + bx, ax + by] + \left[ay + bx \pm ax, \sum_{j=0}^n S_j \right] + \left[\sum_{j=0}^n S_j, ax + by \pm bx \right] \\ &= a^2 - b^2 + \left[(a + b)x, \sum_{j=0}^n S_j \right] + \left[\sum_{j=0}^n S_j, (a + b)x \right] = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $[x - y, S_j] = 0$. A straightforward computation shows that for

$$f_2 : x \mapsto \frac{x}{a - b}, \quad y \mapsto (a - b)y, \quad f_3 : x \mapsto x + y, \quad y \mapsto y, \quad f_4 : x \mapsto x - y, \quad y \mapsto y$$

and

$$f_1 : x \mapsto x, \quad y \mapsto y - \frac{bx}{a - b} - \sum_{j=0}^n c_j \left(\frac{x}{a - b} \right)^{2j},$$

we have $id = f_1 \circ f_2 \circ f_3 \circ f \circ f_4$ and so $f^{-1} = f_4 \circ f_1 \circ f_2 \circ f_3$, explicitly

$$f^{-1}(x) = ax - by + (b - a) \sum_{j=0}^n \tilde{S}_j \quad \text{and} \quad f^{-1}(y) = ay - bx + (b - a) \sum_{j=0}^n \tilde{S}_j,$$

where $\tilde{S}_j := c_j \left(\frac{x - y}{a - b} \right)^{2j}$.

Surprisingly, the family of α -automorphisms of Example 1.3 describes all the α -endomorphisms of $A_1(K)$ (see Corollary 2.8). Therefore, the starred Dixmier conjecture is true.

2 Proof of the starred Dixmier conjecture

Consider the automorphism φ of A_1 given by $\varphi(x) := \frac{x+y}{2}$ and $\varphi(y) := y-x$. Then $\varphi^{-1}(x) = x - \frac{y}{2}$, $\varphi^{-1}(y) = x + \frac{y}{2}$ and the antihomomorphism $\beta := \varphi^{-1} \circ \alpha \circ \varphi$ is given by $\beta(x) = x$ and $\beta(y) = -y$. Notice that β is an involution.

For the rest of the section we fix an α -endomorphism f . Then the endomorphism $\tilde{f} := \varphi^{-1} \circ f$ satisfies

$$\beta(\tilde{f}(x)) = \varphi^{-1} \circ \alpha \circ \varphi(\varphi^{-1} \circ f(x)) = \varphi^{-1} \alpha(f(x)) = \varphi^{-1}(f(\alpha(x))) = \tilde{f}(y)$$

and similarly $\beta(\tilde{f}(y)) = \tilde{f}(x)$. (Note that $\tilde{f}$ is NOT a β -endomorphism).

We set $P := \tilde{f}(x)$ and $Q := \tilde{f}(y)$. Since $\tilde{f}$ is an endomorphism, we have $[Q, P] = 1$. We decompose P into its symmetric and antisymmetric terms with respect to β : $P = P_0 + P_1$ with $P_0 = (P + \beta(P))/2$ and $P_1 = (P - \beta(P))/2$. Note that $\beta(P_0) = P_0$ and $\beta(P_1) = -P_1$. Now $\beta(P) = Q$ implies $Q = P_0 - P_1$, and so

$$1 = [Q, P] = [P_0 - P_1, P_0 + P_1] = 2[P_0, P_1],$$

hence $[P_0, P_1] = 1/2$.

We recall some definitions and notations of [9]. Let $L := K[X, Y]$ be the polynomial K -algebra in two variables and let $\Psi: A_1 \rightarrow L$ be the K -linear map defined by $\Psi(x^i y^j) := X^i Y^j$. Let

$$\overline{\mathfrak{V}} := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : \gcd(\rho, \sigma) = 1 \text{ and } \rho + \sigma \geq 0\}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{V} := \{(\rho, \sigma) \in \overline{\mathfrak{V}} : \rho + \sigma > 0\}.$$

Note that $\overline{\mathfrak{V}} = \mathfrak{V} \cup \{(1, -1), (-1, 1)\}$.

Definition 2.1. For all $(\rho, \sigma) \in \overline{\mathfrak{V}}$ and $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ we write

$$v_{\rho, \sigma}(i, j) := \rho i + \sigma j.$$

Notations 2.2. Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \overline{\mathfrak{V}}$. For $P = \sum a_{ij} X^i Y^j \in L \setminus \{0\}$, we define:

- The *support* of P as

$$\text{Supp}(P) := \{(i, j) : a_{ij} \neq 0\}.$$

- The (ρ, σ) -*degree* of P as $v_{\rho, \sigma}(P) := \max \{v_{\rho, \sigma}(i, j) : a_{ij} \neq 0\}$.
- The (ρ, σ) -*leading term* of P as

$$\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) := \sum_{\{\rho i + \sigma j = v_{\rho, \sigma}(P)\}} a_{ij} X^i Y^j.$$

- $w(P) := (i_0, i_0 - v_{1, -1}(P))$ such that

$$i_0 = \max \{i : (i, i - v_{1, -1}(P)) \in \text{Supp}(\ell_{1, -1}(P))\},$$

- $\overline{w}(P) := (i_0 - v_{-1, 1}(P), i_0)$ such that

$$i_0 = \max \{i : (i - v_{-1, 1}(P), i) \in \text{Supp}(\ell_{-1, 1}(P))\},$$

Notations 2.3. Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \overline{\mathfrak{V}}$. For $P \in A_1 \setminus \{0\}$, we define:

- The *support* of P as $\text{Supp}(P) := \text{Supp}(\Psi(P))$.
- The (ρ, σ) -*degree* of P as $v_{\rho, \sigma}(P) := v_{\rho, \sigma}(\Psi(P))$.
- The (ρ, σ) -*leading term* of P as $\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P) := \ell_{\rho, \sigma}(\Psi(P))$.
- $w(P) := w(\Psi(P))$ and $\overline{w}(P) := \overline{w}(\Psi(P))$.

Definition 2.4. Let $(\rho, \sigma) \in \overline{\mathfrak{V}}$ and let $P \in W \setminus \{0\}$.

- If $(\rho, \sigma) \neq (1, -1)$, then the *starting point of P with respect to (ρ, σ)* is

$$\text{st}_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = w(\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P)).$$

- If $(\rho, \sigma) \neq (-1, 1)$, then the *end point of P with respect to (ρ, σ)* is

$$\text{en}_{\rho, \sigma}(P) = \overline{w}(\ell_{\rho, \sigma}(P)).$$

Lemma 2.5. Let $P, Q \in A_1$ with $[Q, P] = 1$. If $\ell_{1,0}(Q) = \lambda X^s Y$ for some $\lambda \in K^*$, then $s = 0$.

Proof. Assume by contradiction that $s > 0$ and take T_0 such that $[Q, T_0] = 1$ and

$$v_{1,0}(T_0) = \min\{v_{1,0}(T) \mid [Q, T] = 1, T \in A_1\}.$$

Notice that $v_{1,0}(T_0) > 0$, since otherwise $T_0 \in K[y]$ and then $T_0 = p(y)$ for some polynomial $p(y)$ and $[Q, T_0]_{1,0} = -\lambda p'(y)y \neq \ell_{1,0}(1)$, a contradiction.

If $[Q, T_0]_{1,0} \neq 0$ (See [9, Definition 2.2]), then we obtain the contradiction

$$0 = v_{1,0}([Q, T_0]) = v_{1,0}(Q) + v_{1,0}(T_0) - 1 > 0.$$

On the other hand, if $[Q, T_0]_{1,0} = 0$ then by [9, Theorem 2.11] there exist $R \in L$, $\lambda_Q, \lambda_P \in K^*$ and $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\ell_{1,0}(Q) = \lambda_Q R^n \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{1,0}(T_0) = \lambda_t R^m.$$

Clearly $n = 1$ and so $\ell_{1,0}(T_0) = \frac{\lambda_t}{\lambda_Q^m} (\ell_{1,0}(Q))^m$, hence $T_1 := T_0 - \frac{\lambda_t}{\lambda_Q^m} Q^m$ satisfies $[Q, T_1] = 1$ and $v_{1,0}(T_1) < v_{1,0}(T_0)$, which contradicts the minimality of $v_{1,0}(T_0)$ and concludes the proof. $\square$

In the following proposition K is any field with $\text{Char}(K) \neq 2$, not necessarily a zero characteristic field.

Proposition 2.6. Let $P_0, P_1 \in A_1(K)$. Assume $2r \neq 0$ in K , where $r = \deg_x(P_0)$. If $\beta(P_0) = P_0$, $\beta(P_1) = -P_1$ and $[P_0, P_1] = \frac{1}{2}$, then

$$P_1 = \lambda y \quad \text{and} \quad P_0 = -\frac{1}{2\lambda}x + \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j y^{2j}, \quad \text{for some } \lambda \neq 0 \text{ and } \alpha_j \in K.$$

Proof. Write $\ell_{1,0}(P_0) = X^r g(Y)$ and $\ell_{1,0}(P_1) = X^s h(Y)$. Then

$$\ell_{1,0}(\beta(P_0)) = \ell_{1,0}(g(-y)x^r) = X^r g(-Y),$$

and so $g(-y) = g(y)$, i.e., g is even, which means $g(y) \in K[y^2]$. Similarly

$$\ell_{1,0}(\beta(P_1)) = \ell_{1,0}(h(-y)x^s) = X^s h(-Y),$$

and so $h(-y) = -h(y)$, i.e., h is odd, which means $h(y) \in yK[y^2]$.

Assume $s = 0$, then $\text{en}_{1,0}(P_1) = (0, 2k + 1)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If $\text{en}_{1,0}(P_1) \sim \text{en}_{1,0}(P_0)$ then $P_0 \in K[y]$ which leads to the contradiction $[P_0, P_1] = 0$. Hence $\text{en}_{1,0}(P_1) \not\sim \text{en}_{1,0}(P_0)$ and so, by [9, Corollary 2.7] we have $[P_0, P_1]_{1,0} \neq 0$ and by [9, Proposition 2.4]

$$\text{en}_{1,0}(P_0) + \text{en}_{1,0}(P_1) - (1, 1) = \text{en}_{1,0}([P_0, P_1]) = (0, 0).$$

It follows that $k = 0$, $\text{en}_{1,0}(P_0) = (1, 0)$ and $P_1 = \lambda y$ for some $\lambda \in K^*$. But then $P_0 = -\frac{1}{2\lambda}x + t(y)$ for some $t(y) \in K[y]$ and from $\beta(P_0) = P_0$ we deduce $t(y) = \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j y^{2j}$ for some $\alpha_j \in K$.

In order to finish the proof it suffices to discard the case $s > 0$. So assume $s > 0$ and note that the assumptions require $r > 0$. We will consider the two highest order terms in $\deg_x$. By [9, Proposition 1.6] for all $t(y) \in K[y]$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$[t(y), x^i] = ix^{i-1}t'(y) + \binom{i}{2}x^{i-2}t''(y) + \dots, \quad (2.1)$$

where from now on “...” denotes terms of lower x -degree. Write now

$$P_0 = x^r g(y) + x^{r-1} g_1(y) + \dots \quad \text{and} \quad P_1 = x^s h(y) + x^{s-1} h_1(y) + \dots$$

Then

$$\beta(P_0) = g(y)x^r + g_1(-y)x^{r-1} + \dots = x^r g(y) + rx^{r-1}g'(y) + x^{r-1}g_1(-y) + \dots$$

From $\beta(P_0) = P_0$ we deduce $g_1(y) = rg'(y) + g_1(-y)$. Decomposing g_1 into its even and odd parts we obtain $g_1(y) = g_{10}(y) + g_{11}(y)$ with $g_{10} \in K[y^2]$ and $g_{11} \in yK[y^2]$ and so

$$g_1(y) = g_{10}(y) + \frac{r}{2}g'(y). \quad (2.2)$$

Similarly we obtain

$$h_1(y) = \frac{s}{2}h'(y) + h_{11}(y) \quad \text{for some } h_{11} \in yK[y^2]. \quad (2.3)$$

From (2.1) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} [P_0, P_1] &= x^{r+s-1}(sg'h - rh'g) \\ &+ x^{r+s-2} \left(\binom{s}{2}g''h - \binom{r}{2}h''g + (s-1)g'h_1 - rh'_1g + sg'_1h - (r-1)h'g_1 \right) + \dots \end{aligned}$$

We insert in the coefficient corresponding to x^{r+s-2} the values of g_1 and h_1 according to (2.2) and (2.3):

$$\begin{aligned} &\binom{s}{2}g''h - \binom{r}{2}h''g + (s-1)g'h_1 - rh'_1g + sg'_1h - (r-1)h'g_1 = \\ &= (r+s-1)(sg''h + sg'h' - rh'g' - rh''g) + 2rgh'' + \\ &+ (s-1)g'h_{11} - rh'_{11}g + sg'_{10}h - (r-1)h'g_{10}. \end{aligned}$$

Now $sg'h - rh'g = 0$ implies $sg''h + sg'h' - rh'g' - rh''g = 0$ and moreover

$$(s-1)g'h_{11} - rh'_{11}g + sg'_{10}h - (r-1)h'g_{10}$$

is even, hence the odd part of the coefficient is $2rgh'' = 0$. By assumption $2r \neq 0$ and $g \neq 0$, which leads to $h'' = 0$. But then $h = \lambda y$ for some $\lambda \in K^*$. By Lemma 2.5 this implies $s = 0$, a contradiction which concludes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 2.7. *Assume $\text{Char}(K) = 0$. For any α -endomorphism f of $A_1(K)$ there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\lambda \in K^*$ and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \in K$ such that*

$$f(x) = \lambda(y-x) - \frac{y+x}{4\lambda} + \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j (y-x)^{2j}, \quad f(y) = -\lambda(y-x) - \frac{y+x}{4\lambda} + \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j (y-x)^{2j}.$$

Proof. From the discussion above Lemma 2.5 we know that

$$f(x) = \varphi \tilde{f}(x) = \varphi(P_0 + P_1) \quad \text{and} \quad f(y) = \varphi \tilde{f}(y) = \varphi(P_0 - P_1),$$

for some P_0, P_1 satisfying $\beta(P_0) = P_0$, $\beta(P_1) = -P_1$ and $[P_0, P_1] = \frac{1}{2}$. Moreover $r := \deg_x(P_0) = 0$ is impossible since it would lead to $P_0 \in K[y^2]$ which implies $[P_0, P_1] \notin K^*$ (compute $\ell_{1,0}[P_0, P_1]$). Hence $2r \neq 0$ and by Proposition 2.6 we know that there exist $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\lambda \in K^*$ and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \in K$ such that $P_1 = \lambda y$ and $P_0 = -\frac{1}{2\lambda}x + \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j y^{2j}$. A straightforward computation concludes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 2.8. *Assume $\text{Char}(K) = 0$. Any α -endomorphism f of $A_1(K)$ is an α -automorphism of the same form as in Example 1.3.*

Proof. Let f be an α -endomorphism. Apply Corollary 2.7 to f to get $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\lambda \in K^*$ and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n \in K$ such that

$$f(x) = \lambda(y-x) - \frac{y+x}{4\lambda} + \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j (y-x)^{2j}, \quad f(y) = -\lambda(y-x) - \frac{y+x}{4\lambda} + \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j (y-x)^{2j}.$$

Hence,

$$f(x) = ax + by + \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j (y-x)^{2j} \quad \text{and} \quad f(y) = ay + bx + \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j (y-x)^{2j},$$

where $a = (-4\lambda^2 - 1)/4\lambda$ and $b = (4\lambda^2 - 1)/4\lambda$ satisfy $a^2 - b^2 = 1$, and so the endomorphism is of the desired form. $\square$

Theorem 2.9 (The starred Dixmier conjecture is true). *Assume $\text{Char}(K) = 0$. Any α -endomorphism f of $A_1(K)$ is an α -automorphism.*

Proof. Clear from Corollary 2.8 and Example 1.3. $\square$

3 Related topics

We suggest to consider the following topics. In those topics we usually take the exchange involution α , although one may take other involutions as well.

3.1 Prime characteristic case

When K is of prime characteristic, $A_1(K)$ is not simple. Bavula asked the following question: Is every algebra endomorphism of the first Weyl algebra $A_1(K)$, $\text{Char}(K) = p > 0$, a monomorphism? Makar-Limanov [11] gave a positive answer to that question. However, the following endomorphism f (f is necessarily a monomorphism) is not onto, since x is not in the image of f :

$$f : A_1 \longrightarrow A_1 \text{ such that } f(x) = x + x^p \text{ and } f(y) = y.$$

Note that Proposition 2.6 is valid for $\text{Char}(K) \neq 2$. This suggest that the following is true (the starred Dixmier conjecture in the positive characteristic case, compare with [1]):

“Let $\text{Char}(K) = p > 2$. Any α -endomorphism of $A_1(K)$ is an automorphism if and only if its restriction to the center of A_1 induces a field extension of degree not a multiple of p and the jacobian of this restriction is a nonzero element of K .”

3.2 Higher Weyl algebras

Assume $\text{Char}(K) = 0$ and let $A_n(K)$ be the n 'th Weyl algebra and $\alpha : A_n \rightarrow A_n$ an involution, for example the anti-homomorphism given by $x_i \mapsto y_i$, $y_i \mapsto x_i$. If one generalizes the geometric methods of [9] to higher dimensions, one could try to prove the n 'th starred Dixmier conjecture ($\alpha - D_n$): “Any α -endomorphism of A_n is an automorphism.”

3.3 Same questions for other algebras

One may wish to ask similar questions for other algebras, see, for example, [4]. In algebras where an involution can be defined, one may wish to see if the presence of an involution may be of any help in solving such questions.

3.4 Connection to the Jacobian conjecture

The connection between Dixmier's problem 1 and the Jacobian conjecture is as follows:

- (1) The n 'th Dixmier conjecture, D_n (Every endomorphism of $A_n(K)$ is an automorphism), implies JC_n , the n -dimensional Jacobian conjecture, see [13, Theorem 4.2.8].
- (2) $JC_{2n} \Rightarrow D_n$.

Interestingly, the Jacobian conjecture- $2n$ implies the n 'th Dixmier conjecture. This was proved independently by Tsuchimoto [12] and by Belov and Kontsevich [5]. A shorter proof can be found in [3]. For a detailed background on the Jacobian conjecture, see, for example, [2] or [13]. One may pose the α -Jacobian conjecture (α - JC_{2n}) in dimension $2n$: "Let $\alpha : X_{2n-1} \leftrightarrow X_{2n}$ be the exchange involution on $K[X_1, \dots, X_{2n}]$. If $f : K[X_1, \dots, X_{2n}] \rightarrow K[X_1, \dots, X_{2n}]$ is an α -morphism which satisfies $\text{Jac}(f(X_1), \dots, f(X_{2n})) = 1$, then f is invertible."

One may ask the following question: $\alpha - JC_{2n} \Rightarrow \alpha - D_n$?

In the previous section we proved $\alpha - D_1$ and in the last section we will prove $\alpha - JC_2$; however we don't know if one can deduce $\alpha - D_1$ directly from $\alpha - JC_2$.

4 Analogue results for the Jacobian conjecture

There is a closed connection between the shape of possible counterexamples to the Jacobian conjecture in dimension 2 and the shape of possible counterexamples to the Dixmier conjecture (in dimension 1). Let $\alpha : K[X, Y] \rightarrow K[X, Y]$ be the exchange involution $X \leftrightarrow Y$. We say that $f : K[X, Y] \rightarrow K[X, Y]$ is an α -morphism, if $f \circ \alpha = \alpha \circ f$. Note that the symmetry determined by α is not any of the symmetries analyzed in [6] or [14].

One has the following result:

Proposition 4.1. ($\alpha - JC_2$ is true.) *If K is a field of characteristic zero and $f : K[X, Y] \rightarrow K[X, Y]$ is an α -morphism that satisfies $\text{Jac}(f(X), f(Y)) = 1$, then f is an automorphism.*

Proof. Let $\varphi : K[X, Y] \rightarrow K[X, Y]$ be given by $\varphi(X) := \frac{X+Y}{2}$ and $\varphi(Y) := Y - X$. Then $\varphi^{-1}(X) = X - \frac{Y}{2}$, $\varphi^{-1}(Y) = X + \frac{Y}{2}$ and the homomorphism $\beta := \varphi^{-1} \circ \alpha \circ \varphi$ is given by $\beta(X) = X$ and $\beta(Y) = -Y$. Notice that β is an involution which commutes with $\tilde{f} := \varphi^{-1} \circ f \circ \varphi$, since f is an α -morphism. This means that $P := \tilde{f}(X)$ and $Q := \tilde{f}(Y)$ satisfy

$$\beta(P) = \beta(\tilde{f}(X)) = \tilde{f}(\beta(X)) = P, \quad \beta(Q) = \beta(\tilde{f}(Y)) = \tilde{f}(\beta(Y)) = -Q$$

and $\text{Jac}(P, Q) = 1$. We will prove that for $P, Q \in K[X, Y]$ with $\beta(P) = P$, $\beta(Q) = -Q$ and $\text{Jac}(P, Q) = 1$ there exist $\lambda \in K^\times$ and $g \in K[Y^2]$ such that $Q = \lambda Y$ and $P = \frac{X}{\lambda} + g(Y)$.

This implies that $\tilde{f}$ is invertible, with $\tilde{f}^{-1}(X) = \lambda X - \lambda g\left(\frac{Y}{\lambda}\right)$ and $\tilde{f}^{-1}(Y) = \frac{Y}{\lambda}$; hence f is also invertible.

We adopt the notations and results of [10], in particular $[P, Q] := \text{Jac}(P, Q)$. Let P and Q be as above. It is clear that $P \in K[X, Y^2]$ and $Q \in YK[X, Y^2]$. Then $w_{0,1}(P) \geq 0$ and $w_{0,1}(Q) \geq 1$ and so, since by [10, Proposition 1.11] we have

$$0 = w_{0,1}([P, Q]) \geq w_{0,1}(P) + w_{0,1}(Q) - (0 + 1),$$

it follows that $w_{0,1}(P) = 0$, $w_{0,1}(Q) = 1$ and $0 \neq [\ell_{0,1}(P), \ell_{0,1}(Q)] = \ell_{0,1}([P, Q])$, by the same proposition. Write $\ell_{0,1}(P) = h_p(X)$ and $\ell_{0,1}(Q) = Yh_q(X)$, then

$$1 = [\ell_{0,1}(P), \ell_{0,1}(Q)] = h'_p(X)h_q(X),$$

hence

$$\ell_{0,1}(Q) = \lambda Y \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{0,1}(P) = \frac{1}{\lambda} X,$$

for some $\lambda \in K^\times$. We prove now that

$$\ell_{1,0}(Q) = \lambda Y \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{1,0}(P) = \frac{1}{\lambda} X. \quad (4.4)$$

Let $(\rho, \sigma) := \min\{\text{Succ}_P(0, 1), \text{Succ}_Q(0, 1)\}$. We first prove that

$$(\rho, \sigma) = (-1, 1), \quad \ell_{1,-1}(P) = \frac{1}{\lambda} X \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{1,-1}(Q) = \lambda Y. \quad (4.5)$$

Note that by [10, Proposition 3.13] we have $\text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = (1, 0)$ and $\text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = (0, 1)$. Moreover, using the definition of the order on directions of [10, Section 3], the inequalities $(-1, 1) \geq (\rho, \sigma) > (0, 1)$, imply $\sigma \geq -\rho > 0$. Hence

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(\text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(1, 0) = \rho < 0$$

and

$$v_{\rho,\sigma}(\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(\text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)) = v_{\rho,\sigma}(0, 1) = \sigma > 0,$$

and so $\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) \approx \text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)$, since two non-zero points A, B in the first quadrant are aligned if and only if $A = \gamma B$ for some $\gamma > 0$. But then, by [10, Proposition 2.3(2)] we have $[\ell_{\rho,\sigma}(P), \ell_{\rho,\sigma}(Q)] \neq 0$ and so, by [10, Proposition 2.5(2)],

$$\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) + \text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) - (1, 1) = \text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}([P, Q]) = (0, 0).$$

But the only non-aligned points in $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ which sum $(1, 1)$, are $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$, hence the only possibility is

$$\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = \text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(P) = (1, 0)$$

and

$$\text{en}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = \text{st}_{\rho,\sigma}(Q) = (0, 1).$$

Since $(\rho, \sigma) \in \overline{\text{Dir}}(P) \cup \overline{\text{Dir}}(Q)$ it follows that $(\rho, \sigma) = (-1, 1)$, $\ell_{1,-1}(P) = \frac{1}{\lambda} X$ and $\ell_{1,-1}(Q) = \lambda Y$, which is (4.5).

We claim that

$$(\rho_1, \sigma_1) := \min\{\text{Succ}_P(1, -1), \text{Succ}_Q(1, -1)\} \geq (1, 0). \quad (4.6)$$

In fact the geometric argument is the same as before: Assume $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) < (1, 0)$. Note that by [10, Proposition 3.12] we have $\text{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) = (1, 0)$ and $\text{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q) = (0, 1)$. Moreover, using the definition of the order on directions of [10, Section 3], the inequalities $(1, -1) \leq (\rho_1, \sigma_1) < (1, 0)$, imply $\rho_1 \geq -\sigma_1 > 0$. Hence

$$v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)) = v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\text{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P)) = v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(1, 0) = \rho_1 > 0$$

and

$$v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q)) = v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(\text{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q)) = v_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(0, 1) = \sigma_1 < 0,$$

and so $\text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) \approx \text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q)$, since two non-zero points A, B in the first quadrant are aligned if and only if $A = \gamma B$ for some $\gamma > 0$. But then, by [10, Proposition 2.3(1)] we have $[\ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P), \ell_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q)] \neq 0$ and so, by [10, Proposition 2.4(2)],

$$\text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) + \text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(Q) - (1, 1) = \text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}([P, Q]) = (0, 0).$$

But the only non-aligned points in $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0$ which sum $(1, 1)$, are $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$, hence the only possibility is

$$\text{en}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) = \text{st}_{\rho_1,\sigma_1}(P) = (1, 0)$$

and

$$\text{en}_{\rho_1, \sigma_1}(Q) = \text{st}_{\rho_1, \sigma_1}(Q) = (0, 1).$$

But this contradicts the fact that $(\rho_1, \sigma_1) \in \text{Dir}(P) \cup \text{Dir}(Q)$ and proves (4.6).

Now from (4.6) and [10, Proposition 3.12] it follows that $\text{st}_{1,0}(Q) = (0, 1)$ and $\text{st}_{1,0}(P) = (1, 0)$, hence

$$v_{1,0}(Q) = v_{1,0}(\text{st}_{1,0}(Q)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v_{1,0}(P) = v_{1,0}(\text{st}_{1,0}(P)) = 1,$$

which implies

$$Q = g_Q(Y) \quad \text{and} \quad P = g(Y) + Xg_P(Y), \quad \text{for some } g_Q(Y), g(Y), g_P(Y) \in K[Y],$$

with $g(Y) \in K[Y^2]$. But then

$$1 = [P, Q] = g_P(Y)g'_Q(Y),$$

hence $g_Q(Y) = \lambda Y$ and $g_P(Y) = \frac{1}{\lambda}$, which proves (4.4) and concludes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.2. From Proposition 4.1, it can easily be seen that each α -morphism f which satisfies $\text{Jac}(f(X), f(Y)) = 1$ is of the following form:

$$f(X) := aX + bY + \sum_{j=0}^n T_j \quad \text{and} \quad f(Y) := aY + bX + \sum_{j=0}^n T_j$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $a, b \in K$, with $a^2 - b^2 = 1$, and $T_j := c_j(X - Y)^{2j}$ for some $c_0, \dots, c_n \in K$.

One can structure the proof of $\alpha - JC_2$ similar to the proof of $\alpha - D_1$, however the key difference is the following: In the proof of $\alpha - D_1$ we obtain a contradiction using the second highest order term via (2.1), which is not present in $\alpha - JC_2$, if we identify the commutator with the Jacobian bracket. On the other hand, in the proof of $\alpha - JC_2$ we make use of $\ell\ell_{\rho, \sigma}$, which is not well-behaved in $A_1(K)$.

References

- [1] K. Adjmagbo, A. van den Essen, On the equivalence of the Jacobian, Dixmier and Poisson conjectures in any characteristic, *arXiv:math/0608009v1 [math.AG]* 1 Aug 2006.
- [2] H. Bass, E. Connell and D. Wright, The Jacobian conjecture: reduction of degree and formal expansion of the inverse, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (New Series)*, 7, 287-330, 1982.
- [3] V.V. Bavula, The Jacobian conjecture- $2n$ implies the Dixmier problem- n , *arXiv:math/0512250v1 [math.RA]* 12 Dec 2005.
- [4] V.V. Bavula, An analogue of the conjecture of Dixmier is true for the algebra of polynomial integro-differential operators, *Journal of Algebra* 372, pp. 237-250, 2012.
- [5] A. Belov-Kanel, M. Kontsevich, The Jacobian conjecture is stably equivalent to the Dixmier conjecture, *Mosc. Math. J.* 7, no. 2, 209-218, 349, 2007.
- [6] M. de Bondt, Symmetric Jacobians, *arXiv:1206.2865 [math.AG]*, 24 Oct 2013
- [7] P.A.M. Dirac, On quantum algebra, *Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.*, 23, 412-418, 1926.
- [8] J. Dixmier, Sur les algebres de Weyl, *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, vol. 96, 209-242, 1968.
- [9] J.A. Guccione, J.J. Guccione, and C. Valqui, The Dixmier conjecture and the shape of possible counterexamples, *Journal of Algebra*, v. 399, p. 581-633, 2014
- [10] J.A. Guccione, J.J. Guccione, and C. Valqui, On the shape of possible counterexamples to the Jacobian Conjecture, *arXiv:1401.1784 [math.AC]*, 8 Jan 2014
- [11] L. Makar-Limanov, A conjecture of Bavula on homomorphisms of the Weyl algebra, *Linear and Multilinear Algebra* 60 (7), pp. 787-796, 2012.
- [12] Y. Tsuchimoto, Endomorphisms of Weyl algebra and p -curvature, *Osaka J. Math.* 42, no. 2, 435-452, 2005.
- [13] A. Van den Essen, Polynomial automorphisms and the Jacobian conjecture, *Progress in Mathematics*, 190. Birkhuser Verlag, Basel, 2000.
- [14] A. van den Essen and S. Washburn, The Jacobian conjecture for symmetric Jacobian matrices *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 189 (1-3), pp. 123-133, 2004

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT-GAN 52900, ISRAEL.
E-mail address: `vered.moskowitz@gmail.com`

PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DEL PERÚ PUCP, AV. UNIVERSITARIA 1801, SAN MIGUEL,
LIMA 32, PERÚ.

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA Y CIENCIAS AFINES (IMCA) CALLE LOS BIÓLOGOS 245. URB SAN
CÉSAR. LA MOLINA, LIMA 12, PERÚ.
E-mail address: `cvalqui@pucp.edu.pe`